

# OVERCOMING GENDER DYSPHORIA

---

An increasingly common point of contention for people in the West is the issue over so-called “transgenders”, i.e. people who have transitioned from one gender to the other. Further, there have even been new classifications of “genderless” groups, non-binaries and so forth. But gender and its related concepts did not emerge from thin air. Rather, they are the result of thousands of years of human evolution, and are a dynamic reflection of the constantly changing social conditions existing within society.

Friedrich Engels described in *Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State* that the process of reproduction and marriage is a vital part to the health of a society, and further asserted that all developments in marriage were bound to end at the point of strict monogamy:

The study of primitive history, however, reveals conditions where the men live in polygamy and their wives in polyandry at the same time, and their common children are therefore considered common to them all – and **these conditions in their turn undergo a long series of changes before they finally end in monogamy**. The trend of these changes is to narrow more and more the circle of people comprised within the common bond of marriage, which was originally very wide, until at last it includes only the single pair, the dominant form of marriage today.

**As sexual love is by its nature exclusive – although at present this exclusiveness is fully realized only in the woman – the marriage based on sexual love is by its nature individual marriage... If now the economic considerations also disappear which made women put up with the habitual infidelity of their husbands – concern for their own means of existence and still more for their children’s future – then, according to all previous experience, the equality of woman thereby achieved will tend infinitely more to make men really monogamous than to make women polyandrous.**

Marriage arose in order to facilitate the reproduction of societies; societies which did not reproduce obviously died out. The stages of the development of marriage look something like this:

**The Consanguine Family:** The family, at this point a wandering savage tribe, has virtually no sexual rules. The entire family is “married” with itself: mothers reproduce with sons, brothers with sisters, cousins, and so forth. Further, the entire society lived communally, with all goods held in common. The whole society lived in the same shelter, which limited the growth of the family.

**The Punaluan Family:** As soon as the family grew to a size in which the previous shelter was inadequate, new shelters were created, and the “family” split among them, becoming “families”. Whereas before, everyone was married to one another, now whole families married to one another while remaining internally chaste.

At this point, children born from the same mother are prohibited from intercourse with one another. Though societies which began to conform to this rule did not understand why, it was bound to become the rule, as offspring produced between siblings will be genetically defective, and a society which practices this at large is bound to devolve into a large inbred family stuck in the communal (Consanguine) stage. Further restricted is intercourse with and between children, as children cannot reproduce without being seriously physically harmed<sup>1</sup>.

However, because marriage and reproduction was still something done in groups, between whole families, the definite father of a child could not be known. Only the mother, from which the child was directly born, could be definitely pointed to as the parent of a given person. Thus, the first development of gender occurs: the development of womanhood. The “woman” emerges as a reflection of the material characteristics making up those who can be definitively linked to their children, i.e. those with a womb capable of giving birth. At this point, women are considered the “heads” of the society and its families.

Along with the concept of women, the idea of “men” develops, simply, those that do not undergo pregnancy, but rather, impregnate others. At this point, men occupy a subordinate position to women. Because of this, particularly respected men are allowed to ‘defy’ the established norms and recognize themselves as women, even without a womb. This is the first development of “transgenderism”, of a person from one gender transitioning into another.

**The Pairing Family:** This stage is much closer to the monogamous stage. As the process of marriage between whole families continued and, simultaneously, the cousins became more and more numerous, it became increasingly impossible to arrange marriages between whole groups which would not be partially or predominantly incestuous. Thus, it was necessary that people should begin to seek marriage on an individual basis, rather than on a family basis.

However, it still remained ultimately an offshoot of group marriage: the “pairing family” was something like polygamy. Men had multiple wives, and women had multiple husbands, just like before under the group system. These wives and husbands were not mutual with one another; a man had his set of wives, and a woman had her set of husbands, which were decided independently from one another.

Also at this point is the development of private property, of large-scale agriculture, and so forth, further displacing the once large “shelters” into many small “homes”. The supremacy of women has largely faded, as the increasingly organized process of marriage no longer leaves children without knowledge of their fathers. If anything, the man and the woman are at this stage somewhat “equal”, though the supremacy of man is rising and the supremacy of woman is falling.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hence our psychological repulsion to it, the product of thousands of years of evolution. Pedophilia is not normal, and is a devolution from our evolutionary path; it is “degeneracy”, rather than generation, development.

**The Early Monogamous Family:** In this stage, the pairing system has largely disappeared for women, remaining only for men. Women are now kept forcefully under their husband's watch, unallowed to leave the house, associate with other men, or pursue education, profession, or otherwise. Men, on the contrary, still occupy something like the pairing stage: whether by polygyny (in its earliest stages) or prostitution (later on), the man still satisfies himself with all sorts of carnal pleasures, accidental births, and sexual diseases, while the woman may not so much as leave the "maiden's quarter" of the house, lest she be whipped or worse.

The prostitutes which the man indulges in intercourse with cannot possibly be called "wives", in the real sense. If they are to have children, then the children are discarded or disowned by the fathers, and remain only the prostitute's responsibility.

Because the man may content himself with sex at any time from prostitutes, sex with the wife becomes a matter of *only* reproduction, whereas before it was a process of both pleasure and reproduction. The woman is now only an instrument for the reproduction of the man's children: the man is now only a pleasure seeker, forcing the woman to mother his children at the threat of whippings and beatings while partaking in carnal pleasures elsewhere.

At this time, the only women accorded any respect by society are the prostitutes and the most submissive wives. Also is the re-development of homosexuality, its sudden flourishing, as well as pedophilia; in particularly developed cultures, like Rome and Greece, things go as far as pederasty (mentored homosexual pedophilia); having reduced intercourse to a mere act of pleasure, and not of pleasure *and* reproduction, the man again falls into individualistic, unproductive intercourse, and takes all of society with him.

Engels did not live to see it, but we still much occupy this stage today in the West, where women are also allowed to partake in indulgent pleasure seeking so that they do not realize who the system is set up for.

**The Developed Monogamous Family:** We will not elaborate too much on this system. It is the natural conclusion to all the other systems. As Engels described it, it is monogamy for both the man and the woman, whereas what we currently live under is monogamy for the woman, polygyny for the man.

Since it is men who brought us into a stage where the development of women was suppressed, it is the *inherent and primary responsibility of men* to bring about the developed monogamous stage. And this *cannot* be done if one is unsure of the origin of gender, gender roles, and how to develop them forwards, or if one is insistent on pleasure-seeking, indulgent sex, and so on.

Now that we've discussed that, we may observe transgenderism.

The impetuous to transitioning gender can be one of two things:

(1) Gender dysphoria, which we will explore momentarily, or;

(2) Personal pleasure, which we will not address at all, as such people don't have nor need any sort of political movement worth writing about.

Gender dysphoria is the feeling of loathing one's assigned roles which are derived from the historical backgrounds of the biological sex they are born into. In short, it is the woman's wish not to fulfill the womanly role, the man's wish not to fulfill the manly role.

But what is the woman's role? Does not monogamy, as it currently exists, undermine and subordinate the woman, stifle her development, and force her to become a servant to the man? What will "identifying" as something else really do to change her material condition, the real physical oppression forced on her?

And what is the man's role? Is the man's role not precisely to aid woman in destroying this system, so that women may develop to their full potential? It is inarguable that under liberalism, women are treated as secondary to men. Should men not be helping in fixing this?

The proposition is that there are:

(1) Trans men, i.e. female-to-male.

(2) Trans women, i.e. male-to-female.

But there will remain those who reject transgender identity *regardless of what others insist*. This means they view:

(1) Trans men as still women, and thus, socially *inferior* to men, even if they insist they are men.

(2) Trans women as still men, and thus, socially *superior* to women, even if they insist they are women.

And lastly, even if they agree on the identities, then they believe:

(1) Trans men *are* men, and thus superior to women.

(2) Trans women *are* women, and thus inferior to men.

So what does it mean, really, when we insist on defending (2)? To defend (1) is consistent with our principles, but what kind of argument are we peddling to people with (2), and how can we defend the rights of women simultaneously with (2)?

Should we not be fighting to lift women up to the level of men, and not to allow men to lower themselves to the level presently endured by women?

Men have a *responsibility* to liberate women. And to carry out this responsibility, they must be selfless, in good health, sound of body, prepared to fight, and strive at all times to defend and advance the cause of women.

Are these not the values of traditional masculinity? Do men not have a responsibility to adhere to these principles, so as to lift women from the position *men* have put them in?

Thus, what does it mean to feel dysphoria, to feel self-loathing, and self-hatred towards one's position in this struggle? Is this not surrendering the *whole* cause of the advancement of women for the sake of a personal qualm, a personal dissatisfaction over the few tasks asked of men?

What is this fear of masculinity really indicative of, in our would-be revolutionaries today? These are the people we expect to wage prolonged struggle against international capital?

If one suffers from dysphoria, that is a problem, and they should seek therapy for it. But they should not cure this problem by making *still yet further* encroachments on the grounds of women, by forcing them to cede what little identity they still have.

I ask: do our pro-trans friends think the working women find it amusing hearing us insist that they cede ground like this? To use a term: one must be “terminally online” to think such things elicit a positive response anywhere outside a university club. Does one think that the US is going to decline, or improve with time? Most people will give an honest answer, amounting to decline.

Are we to say that we should prop up this section of the population through censorship and shouting out, so that down the road, when conditions worsen, this meager .03% of the population may come into confrontation with the 99.97% of Americans who *aren't* transgender? Who will win this struggle?

There are other points to be had, but the crux of the problem rests on this point. Are we to seek to eliminate gender dysphoria by raising the conditions of the two genders, or keeping them in place and normalizing the complete surrender to dysphoria by men who should be fighting for the rights of women? How can a man be fighting for women if he is also saying he *is* a woman? Will his male interests – which still exist, even if only subconsciously – not contradict the interests of the women who he now partially represents? Is this not taking over the only sanctuary women have – their tried and tested historical identities as women?

To put it bluntly: whose interests do we put first? The dysphoric man, or the exploited woman? For the dysphoric man to understand the answer to this question is to understand how to overcome gender dysphoria altogether.

J. VOLKER

